

REMARKS

The Office Action alleges that Claims 1-5, 21 and 23 are anticipated, and that Claims 24-25 are obvious. Applicant vigorously maintains that each of these claims is patentable, but in an effort to expedite prosecution of the application, the application has been amended to cancel Claims 1-5, 21 and 23-25 without prejudice or disclaimer, and to rewrite the Claims 6-12 and 22 which the Office Action states contain allowable subject matter. Applicant understands that Claim 29 was inadvertently not listed in paragraph 9 on page 5 of the Office Action, because there is no rejection of the substance of Claim 29. Claim 6 is rewritten in independent format, and is not amended. Claim 22 is rewritten in independent format, and is not amended. Thus, each of Claims 6 and 22 is entitled to the full scope of the doctrine of equivalents in any claim construction. Claims 7-12 and 29 have been amended solely to change the dependency from canceled independent Claim 1 to newly independent Claim 6. This is an amendment dictate by format not the prior art or any other substantive issue. Thus, each of Claims 7-12 and 29 is entitled to the full scope of the doctrine of equivalents in any claim construction.

An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Date: March 2, 2009

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane - Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Telephone: 703-683-0500
Facsimile: 703-683-1080
Email: mail@baconthomas.com

Customer No. 23364

S:\Producer\Tjm\ep\BART3001\USPTO\2009_03_02_Amendment.wpd

Respectfully submitted,

/ThomasJMoore/
Thomas J. Moore
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 28,974